

## REMARKS

Claims 19-25 are pending in this application.

Claims 19-25 are rejected.

The latest office action is non-final. The office action initially indicated that it was final, but SPE F. Ryan Zeender withdrew the finality following a phone call by applicants' attorney Hugh Gortler. SPE Zeender is thanked for intervening.

Claims 21 and 23 have been written in independent form. Claims 20, 22 and 24-25 have been amended to depend from amended claim 21. Claim 19 has been cancelled.

The latest office action indicates that claims 21 and 23 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious over Gryglewicz et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,993,502 in view of documents describing the Nokia IP330 (an integrated firewall/router that offers RealSecure firewall intrusion detection, VPN, anti-virus, and content filtering) and further in view of the **applicants' specification** (at page 18, lines 6-9).

The '103 rejections of claims 21 and 23 are respectfully traversed because prima facie obviousness has not been established. The applicants' specification is not prior art. For this reason alone, the '103 rejection of claim 21 and 23 should be withdrawn.

None of the other cited documents teach or suggest using a firewall such as the Nokia IP3330 in combination with Gryglewicz et al.'s system. The documents describing the Nokia IP330 firewall do not teach or suggest a security means for a public service such as a public tax service. The Nokia firewall uses a private communication network (VPN), which is not well-suited for a public

service. For this additional reason, the '103 rejection of claim 21 should be withdrawn.

The examiner states that the Nokia is cost-competitive and easy to deploy. However, "cost-competitive" and easy deployment are little more than platitudes. They do not explain why it would be obvious to use a managed firewall to prevent unwanted data from being entered into to Grygleweicz's system while data is being transmitted between subscribers and the servers. For this additional reason, the '103 rejection of claim 21 should be withdrawn.

The office action acknowledges that Grygleweicz et al. do not teach or suggest security means that includes a tiered architecture, PKI 2-way authentication and authorization, HTTPS post, with XML document and SSH for remote administration. However, the office action alleges that such security means is obvious.

The documents describing the Nokia IP330 firewall do not teach or suggest a security means that use PKI-2 way authentication. Suffice to say, these documents do not teach or suggest the combination of "a tiered architecture, PKI 2-way authentication and authorization, HTTPS post, with XML document and SSH for remote administration" for providing security for information on the servers and information transmitted between the servers. For this additional reason, the '103 rejection of claim 23 should be withdrawn.

The office action provides no reason at all as to why applying this particular combination of elements to Grygleweicz's system is obvious. For this additional reason, the '103 rejection of claim 23 should be withdrawn.

Finally, the examiner commits legal error in making the '103 rejection of claim 23. The examiner interprets the prior art and alleges that claim 23 reads on the prior art (see, for instance, pages 8-9 of the specification). However, the

examiner is not supposed to interpret the prior art. Rather, he is supposed to provide a reasonable interpretation of the claims in view of the specification, and determine whether the claims read on the prior art. Phillips v. AWH Corp., 03-1269, -1286, p. 16 (Fed.Cir. 2005) citing In re Am.Acad.of.Sci.Tech. Ctr., 367 F.3d 1359 (Fed.Cir. 2004). Thus far, he has not.

Because prima facie obviousness of claims 21 and 23 has not been established, the '103 rejections of claims 20-25 should be withdrawn. The examiner is encouraged to contact applicants' attorney Hugh Gortler to discuss any issues that might remain.

Respectfully submitted,

/Hugh Gortler #33,890/  
Hugh P. Gortler  
Reg. No. 33,890

Hewlett-Packard Company  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400  
(949) 454-0898

Date: August 13, 2007